

TERMS OF THE GLOBE.

Per annum in advance.....\$1 50
Six months.....75
Three months.....50
A failure to notify a discontinuance at the expiration of the term subscribed for will be considered a new engagement.

TERMS OF ADVERTISING.
1 insertion. 2 do. 3 do.
Four lines or less.....\$ 25
One square, (12 lines).....50
Two squares.....1 00
Three squares.....1 50
Over three weeks and less than three months, 25 cents per square for each insertion.

3 months. 6 months. 12 months.
Six lines or less.....\$1 50
One square.....2 00
Two squares.....3 00
Three squares.....4 00
Four squares.....5 00
Half a column.....12 00
One column.....20 00
Professional and Business Cards not exceeding four lines, one year.....25
Administrators' and Executors' Notices.....\$1 75
Advertisements not marked with the number of insertions desired, will be continued till forbid and charged according to these terms.

GREAT SPEECH OF STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS, ON THE HARPER'S FERRY INVASION.

U. S. CAPITOL, WASHINGTON, Jan. 23.
SENATE.

The galleries and floor were crowded this morning to hear Senator Douglas' speech.—The noise and confusion during the morning hour, was so great that it was impossible to hear the reading of the clerk.

At half past one o'clock, the hour fixed for the consideration of the following resolution, offered on Monday last by Senator Douglas:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary be instructed to report a bill for the protection of each State and Territory of the Union against invasion by the authorities or inhabitants of any other State or Territory; and for the suppression and punishment of conspiracies or combinations in any State or Territory, with intent to invade, assault or molest the Government, inhabitants, property, or institutions of any State or Territory of the Union.

Mr. Douglas rose and said:

On the 21st of November last, the Governor of Virginia addressed an official communication to the President of the United States, in which he said, "I have information from various quarters, upon which I rely, that a conspiracy of formidable extent in means and numbers, is formed in Ohio, Pennsylvania, New York, and other States to rescue John Brown and his associates, prisoners at Charlestown, Virginia. The information is specific enough to be reliable;" and again, "Places in Maryland, Ohio, and Pennsylvania have been occupied as depots and rendezvous for those desperadoes, unobstructed by guards, or otherwise, to invade this State, and we are kept in continual apprehension of outrage from fire and rapine. I apprise you of these facts, in order that you may take steps to preserve peace between the States."

To this communication the President of the United States returned a reply, from which I read the following sentence:

"I am at a loss to discover any provision in the Constitution or laws of the United States which would authorize me to take such steps for this purpose." [To preserve the peace between the States.]

This announcement produced a profound impression upon the public mind, and especially in the slaveholding States. It was generally received and regarded as an authoritative declaration that the Constitution of the United States confers no power upon the Federal Government to protect the several States of this Union against invasion from the other States.

I shall not stop to inquire whether it was the meaning of the President to declare that the existing laws conferred no authority upon him, or that the Constitution authorized Congress to enact no laws which would authorize the Federal intervention to protect the States from invasion. My object is to raise the inquiry and ask the judgment of the Senate and the House upon the question whether it is not within the power of Congress, and the duty of Congress under the Constitution, to enact all laws which are necessary and proper for the protection of each and every State against invasion, either from foreign Powers or from any portion of the United States. The denial of the existence of such a power in the Federal Government has induced an inquiry among conservative men—men loyal to the Constitution and devoted to the Union—as to what means of protection they have if the Federal Government is not authorized to protect them against external violence. It must be conceded that no community is safe, and no State can enjoy peace or prosperity, or domestic tranquility, without security against external violence.—Every State and Nation of the world, outside of this Republic, is supposed to maintain armies and navies for this precise purpose.—It is the only legitimate purpose for which armies and navies are maintained in time of peace. They may be kept up for ambitious purposes, for the purpose of aggression and foreign war, but the legitimate purpose of a military force in time of peace, is to insure domestic tranquility against violence or aggression from without their respective limits.

The States of this Union would possess that power were it not for the restraint imposed upon them by the Federal Constitution. When that Constitution was made, the States surrendered to the Federal Government the power to raise and support armies; to provide and maintain navies; and not only surrendered the means of protection from invasion, but consented to a prohibition upon themselves, which declared that "no State shall keep troops or vessels of war in time of peace." Were their hands thus tied by the Constitution? and were they thus stripped of all means of repelling assaults, or maintaining their own existence, without a guarantee from the Federal Government of the Union, to protect them against violence? If the people of this country shall settle down into the conviction that there is no power in the Federal Government, under the Constitution, to protect each and every State from violence, from aggression, and from oppression, they will demand that the cords be severed which thus bind them, and that the weapons be restored to their hands with which they may defend themselves. This inquiry involves the question of the perpetuity of the Union. The means of defense; the means of repelling assaults; the means of providing against invasion, is a necessary condition for the safety and existence of the States.

Now, sir, I hope to be able to demonstrate that there is no wrong in this Union for which the Constitution of the United States has not provided a remedy. I believe that I will be able to maintain that this Union furnishes a remedy for any wrong which can be perpetrated within its borders, if the Federal Government performs its duty. I think that a careful examination of the Constitution will clearly demonstrate that the power is conferred upon Congress—first, to provide for the repelling of invasions from foreign countries; and second, to protect each State of this Union against invasion from any other State, Territory, or place within the jurisdiction of this Confederacy. I will first turn your attention to the power conferred upon Congress to protect the United States, including

WILLIAM LEWIS,

VOL. XV.

HUNTINGDON, PA., FEBRUARY 8, 1860.

—PERSEVERE—

Editor and Proprietor.

NO. 33.

ding States, Territories, and the District of Columbia—including every inch of ground within our limits and jurisdiction—against foreign invasion.

In the eight section of the first article of the Constitution you will find that "Congress shall have power to declare war, &c.; Congress shall have power to raise and support armies; Congress shall have power to provide and maintain a navy; Congress shall have power to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; Congress shall have power to provide for calling forth the militia, to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrection, and repel invasion." These various clauses confer upon Congress the power of using the whole military force of the country for the purposes specified in the Constitution. First, they provide for the execution of the laws of the Union; second to suppress insurrection.—The insurrections referred to are insurrections against the authority of the United States, insurrections against State authority being provided for in a subsequent section, in which cases the United States cannot interfere, except on the application of the State authority. The invasion which is to be repelled under this clause of the Constitution is an invasion of the United States. The language is, "Congress shall have power to provide for repelling invasion." That gives the authority to repel the invasion, no matter whether the enemies land within the limits of Virginia, within the District of Columbia, within the Territory of New Mexico, or anywhere else within the jurisdiction of the United States. The power to protect every portion of the country against invasion from foreign nations having thus been specifically conferred, the framers of the Constitution proceeded to make guarantees for the protection of the several States by Federal authority.—I will read the 4th section of the 4th article of the Constitution: "The United States shall guarantee to every State of this Union a republican form of government; shall protect each of them against invasion, and, on application of the Legislature, or of the Executive when the Legislature cannot be convened, against domestic violence."

The clause contains three distinct guarantees. First, that the United States shall guarantee to every State of this Union a republican form of government; second, that the United States shall protect each of them against invasion; third, that the United States shall, on application of the Legislature, or of the Executive when the Legislature cannot be convened, protect them against domestic violence. Now, sir, I submit to you whether it is not clear, from the very language of the Constitution, that that clause was inserted for the purpose of making it the duty of the Federal Government to protect each of the States against invasion from any other State, Territory, or place within the jurisdiction of the United States? For what other purpose was that clause inserted? The power and duty of protection, as against foreign nations, had already been provided for. This clause occurs where there is a guarantee from the United States to each State, for the benefit of each State, and necessarily for the protection of each State from other States, inasmuch as the guarantee had been given previously as against foreign nations. If any further evidence is needed to show that such is the true construction of the Constitution, it will be found in the forty-third number of *The Federalist*, written by James Madison. Mr. Madison copies this clause of the Constitution which I have read, giving these three guarantees, and, after discussing the one insuring to each State a republican form of government, proceeds to consider the second, which makes it the duty of the United States to protect each of the States against invasion. Here is what he says upon that subject:

"A protection against invasion is due from every society to the parts composing it. The latitude of the expression here used seems to secure each State not only against foreign hostility, but against ambitious or vindictive enterprises by its more powerful neighbors. This history of both ancient and modern confederations proves that the weak members of the Union ought not to be insensible to the policy of this article."

This number of the *Federalist*, which I have quoted from, like all the others of that celebrated work, was written after the Constitution was made, and before it was ratified by the States, and with a view of securing its ratification. Hence the people of the several States, when they ratified this instrument, knew that this clause was intended to bear the construction which I now place upon it. It was intended to make it the duty of every society to protect each of its parts, the duty of the Federal Government to defend each of the States, and he says the smallest States ought not to be insensible to the policy of this article of the Constitution. Then, sir, if it be made the imperative duty of the Federal Government, by the express provision of the Constitution, to protect each of the States against invasion or violence from other States or from combinations of desperadoes within their limits, it necessarily follows that it is the duty of Congress to pass all laws requisite and proper to render that guarantee effectual.

While Congress, in the early history of the Government, did provide legislation which it is supposed is sufficient to protect the United States against invasion from foreign countries, or the Indian tribes, it has failed, up to this time, to make any law for the protection of each of the States against invasion from within the limits of the Union. I am at a loss how to account for this omission. I presume that the reason is to be found in the fact that no Congress ever dreamed that such legislation would, at any time, become necessary for the protection of one State of this Union against invasion and violence from its sister States. Who, until the Harper's Ferry outrage, ever conceived that the American States could be so forgetful of their duties to themselves, their country, and the constitution, as to plan an invasion of another State with a view of stirring up servile insurrection, murder, treason, and every other crime that disgraces humanity? While, therefore, no blame can justly be attached to our predecessors for their failure to provide the legislation necessary to render this guarantee of the Constitution effectual, still, since the experience of the last year, we cannot stand justified in

omitting longer to perform this sacred duty. The question remaining, then, is to know what legislation is required to render this guarantee of the Constitution effectual. I presume there will be very little difference of opinion in respect to the necessity of placing the whole military power of the Government at the disposal of the President, under proper guards and restrictions against abuse, to repel and suppress an invasion when the hostile forces shall be actually in the field. But, sir, that is not sufficient. Such legislation would not be a full compliance with this guarantee of the Constitution. The framers of that instrument meant more when they gave the guarantee. Mark the difference in language between the provision for protecting the United States against invasion, and that for protecting the States. When it provided for protecting the United States, it said: "Congress shall have power to repel invasion;" when it gave this guarantee to the States it changed the language and said: "The United States shall protect each of the States against invasion." In the one instance the duty of the Government is to repel; in the other, the guarantee is that it will protect. In other words, the United States are not permitted to wait until the enemy shall be upon your borders; until the invading army shall have been organized and drilled and put on the march, with a view to invasion, but they must pass all laws necessary and proper to insure protection and domestic tranquility to each State and Territory of this Union against invasion or hostility from other States or Territories. Then, sir, I hope it will not be necessary to use the military power to repel any such invasion if we authorize the judicial department of the Government to suppress all conspiracies and combinations in the several States, with intent to invade a State, or molest or disturb its Government, its peace, its citizens, its property, or its institutions. You must punish the conspiracy, the combination with the intent to do the act, and you will suppress it in advance. There is no principle more familiar to the legal profession than that where ever it is proper to declare an act to be a crime, it is proper to punish a conspiracy and combination entered into for the purpose of perpetrating such act.

Look upon your statute-books, and I think you will find an enactment to punish the counterfeiting of the coin of the United States; one section of which provides for the punishment of a man having counterfeit coin in his possession, with an intent to pass it; and another section for having the mould, die, or instrument for counterfeiting, with intent to use them. This is a familiar principle in legislative and judicial proceedings. If the act of invasion is criminal, the conspiracy to invade should also be criminal. If it be unlawful and illegal to invade a State, or to run off a fugitive, why not make it unlawful to form conspiracies and combinations in the several States with intent to do the act? We have been told that a notorious man who has recently suffered death upon the gallows in Virginia, boasted, in a public lecture in Cleveland, Ohio, a year ago, that he had then in existence an organized body of men employed in running off horses belonging to the slaveholders of Missouri from that State; and pointed to a livery stable in Cleveland which was full of stolen horses at that time. I think it is within our competency, and consequently that it is our duty, to pass a law, making any combination or conspiracy, in any State or Territory of this Union, to invade another with intent to steal and run off property of any kind, whether it be negroes or horses, into another State, a crime punishable by indictment of the conspirators in the United States courts, as well as confinement in the prisons or penitentiaries of the State or Territory where the conspiracy may have been formed. Sir, I would carry this provision of the law as far as our constitutional power will reach. I would make it a crime to form conspiracies with a view of invading States or Territories to control elections whether they be under the garb of the Emigrant Aid Societies of New England, or the Blue Lodges of Missouri. [Applause in the galleries.] In other words, this provision of the Constitution means more than the mere repelling of an invasion when the invading army shall cross the borders of the State.—The language is that it is to protect the State against invasion, which, to use the language of the preamble to the Constitution, means to insure to each State domestic tranquility against external violence. There can be no peace, there can be no prosperity, there can be no safety to any community unless it is secure against violence from without. Why, sir, it has been a question seriously mooted in Europe whether it was not the duty of England—a power foreign to France—to pass laws for the punishment of conspiracies in England against the lives of the princes of France. I shall not argue the question of comity between foreign States. I predicate my argument upon the Constitution by which we are governed, and which we are sworn to obey, and demand that that Constitution be executed in good faith, so as to punish and suppress every combination, every conspiracy, either to invade a State, or to molest its inhabitants, or to disturb its property, or to subvert its institutions or its laws. I believe this can be effectually done by authorizing the United States courts, in the several States, to take jurisdiction of the offences, and accompany a violation of the law with appropriate penalties. It cannot be said that the time has not yet arrived for such legislation. It cannot be said with truth, that the Harper's Ferry case will not again be repeated, or is not in danger of repetition. It is only necessary to inquire into the causes which produced that outrage, and ascertain whether these causes are yet in active operation, and then you can determine whether there is any ground for apprehension that that invasion will be repeated. Sir, what are the causes which produced the raid in Virginia? Without stopping to adduce evidence in detail, I have no hesitation in expressing my firm and deliberate conviction that the Harper's Ferry crime was the natural, logical and inevitable result of the doctrines and teachings of the Republican party,

as explained and enforced in their platforms, their partisan presses, their pamphlets and books, and especially in the speeches of their leaders, in and out of Congress. [Renewed applause in the galleries.]

Mr. Mason, of Virginia, with great gravity, here made his usual threat that he would insist that the galleries should be cleared if there was any more applause.

The Vice President said that it was impossible for him to preserve order in the galleries, unless with the concurrence of Senators.

Mr. Tombs, of Georgia, hoped that the presiding officer would place officers in the gallery to preserve order. It was high time that this interference with the deliberations of Congress was stopped. It was an insult to this body and to a free people.

Mr. Douglas. I would suggest, and I hope the Senate will pardon me for the digression, that the presiding officer station officers in different parts of the gallery with instructions that whenever they see any person giving any signs of approbation or disapprobation, calculated to disturb, they shall instantly lead the offender out of the gallery.

The Vice President. The order has been given.

Mr. Douglas. I remarked that I considered this outrage at Harper's Ferry a logical, natural, and necessary consequence of the teachings and doctrines of the Republican party. I am not making this statement for the purpose of crimination, or for partisan effect. I desire to ask the members of that party to reconsider the doctrines they are in the habit of enforcing, with a view of obtaining their fair judgment as to whether they do not lead directly to the consequences we have lately witnessed, by engaging in their execution those deluded persons who think that all they say is meant in real earnest, and ought to be carried out. The great principle which underlies the organization of the Republican party is the violent, irreconcilable, eternal warfare upon the institution of American slavery, with a view of its ultimate extinction throughout the land—a sectional war to be waged until the cotton fields of the South shall be cultivated by free labor, or the rice fields of New York and Massachusetts shall be cultivated by slave labor. In furtherance of this article of their creed, you find a political organization, not only sectional in its location, but one whose vitality consists in appeals to Northern passion, Northern prejudice, and Northern ambition against Southern States, Southern institutions, and Southern people. I have had some experience in fighting this element within the last few years, and I find that the source of its power consists in exciting the prejudices and passions of the Northern section against those of the Southern section. They not only attempt to excite the North against the South, but they invite the South to assault, abuse, and traduce the North.—The abuse of violent men from the South of Northern Statesmen and the Northern people is, essentially, a triumph of the Republican cause. Hence, we have not only to answer their appeals to Northern passion and prejudice, and to prevent the desired effect, but we have to encounter their appeals to Southern men to assault us in order that they may justify their assaults upon the plea of self-defence.

Sir, when I returned home in 1858, for the purpose of canvassing Illinois with a view to a re-election, I had to meet this issue of the irrepressible conflict. It is true that the Senator from New York had not then made his Rochester speech, and did not for four months afterwards. It is true that he had not given the doctrine that precise character, but the principle was in existence and had then been proclaimed by the ablest and most guarded men of the party. I will call your attention to a single passage from a speech to show the language in which this doctrine was stated in Illinois, before it received the name of the irrepressible conflict. The Republican party assembled in State Convention in June, 1858, in Illinois, and unanimously adopted Abraham Lincoln as their candidate for United States Senator. Mr. Lincoln appeared before the Convention, accepted the nomination, and made a speech, which had been previously written and agreed to in caucus by most of the leaders of that party. I will read a single extract from that speech:

"In my opinion it [the slavery agitation] will not cease until a crisis shall have been reached and passed. 'A house divided against itself cannot stand.' I believe this Government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free. I do not expect the house to fall, but I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing or all the other. Either the opponents of slavery will arrest its further spread here, and there, until it has no more room left in the Union, or its advocates will push forward till it shall become alike lawful in all the States—old as well as new—North as well as South."

The moment I landed upon the soil of Illinois, before a vast gathering of many thousands of my constituents to welcome me home, I read that passage, and took direct issue with the doctrine as being revolutionary and treasonable, and inconsistent with the perpetuity of this Republic. That is not the individual opinion of Mr. Lincoln, or the individual opinion merely of the Senator from New York, who, four months afterwards, asserted the same thing, in different language; but so far as I know, it is the opinion of the members of the Abolition or Republican party.

They tell the North, that, unless we rally as one man, under a sectional banner, and make war upon the South, with a view to the ultimate extinction of slavery, it will overrun the whole North, and fasten itself upon our free States. Then, they tell the South, that, unless you rally as one man, combining your whole Southern people into a sectional party, and establish slavery all over the free States, the inevitable consequence will be that we will abolish it in the slaveholding States. This is the same doctrine held by the Senator from New York in his Rochester speech. He tells us that the States must all become free, or all become slave; in other words, that the South must conquer and subdue the North, or the North must triumph over the South, and drive slavery from its limits. In order to show that I have not misinterpreted the position of the Senator from New York,

in notifying the South that if they wish to maintain slavery within their own limits, they must also fasten it upon the Northern States, I will read an extract from his speech to which I have alluded. He says: "It is an irrepressible conflict between opposing and enduring forces, and it means the United States must, and will, sooner or later, become either entirely a slaveholding nation, or entirely a free-labor nation. Either the cotton and rice fields of South Carolina, and the sugar plantations of Louisiana, will ultimately be tilled by free labor, and Charleston and New Orleans become markets for legitimate merchandise alone, or else the rice fields and the wheat fields of Massachusetts and New York, must again be surrendered by farmers to slave culture and the production of slaves, and Boston and New York once more become markets for the trade in the bodies and souls of men."

Thus, Mr. President, you perceive that the theory of the Republican party is, that there is a conflict between two different systems of institutions in the different States. Not conflict in the same State, but an irrepressible conflict between the free States and the slave States. They will argue that these two systems of States cannot permanently exist in the same Union—that the sectional warfare must continue to rage, increasing in fury until the free States shall surrender, or the Slave States shall be subdued. Hence, while they appeal to the passions of our own section, their object is to alarm the people of the other section, and drive them to madness with the hope that they will invade our rights, and thus furnish them with an excuse to carry on their aggressions upon their rights. I appeal to the candor of Senators, whether this is not a fair exposition of the tendency of the doctrines proclaimed by the Republican party. The creed of that organization is founded upon the theory that, because slavery is not desirable in the free States, it is not desirable anywhere; because free labor is a good thing with us, it must be the best thing everywhere. In other words, their creed rests upon the theory that there must be uniformity in the domestic institutions and internal policy of the several States of this Union. Here, in my opinion, is the fundamental error upon which their whole system rests. I asserted everywhere, in the Illinois campaign, and now repeat, that uniformity in the domestic institutions of the different States is neither possible nor desirable. That is the very issue upon which I conducted the canvass at home, and it is the question which I desire to present to the Senate.

Was such the doctrine of the framers of the Constitution? I wish the country to bear in mind that when the Constitution was adopted, the Union consisted of thirteen States, twelve of which were slaveholding States, and one a free State. Suppose that this doctrine of uniformity on the slavery question had prevailed in the Convention, do the gentlemen on the Republican side of the house think that freedom would have triumphed over slavery? Do they imagine that the one free State would have out-voted the twelve slaveholding States, and thus have abolished slavery by a constitutional provision throughout the land? On the contrary, if the test had then been made, if this doctrine of uniformity on the slavery question had then been proclaimed, and believed in the twelve slaveholding States against the one free State, would it not have resulted in a constitutional provision fastening slavery irrevocably upon every inch of American soil, North as well as South? Was it quite fair for the friends of free institutions in those days to claim that the Federal Government must not touch the question, but leave each State free to do as it pleased, until, under the operation of that principle, they secured a majority, and then wield that majority to abolish slavery in the other States of the Union? Sir, if uniformity in respect to the domestic institutions had been desirable when the Constitution was adopted, there was another mode by which it could have been obtained. The natural mode of obtaining uniformity would have been to have blotted out the State Governments, to have abolished the State Legislatures, and to have conferred upon Congress legislative powers over the municipal and domestic concerns of all the people of all the States, as well as upon the Federal questions affecting the whole Union. And if this doctrine of uniformity had been entertained and favored by the framers of the Constitution, such would have been the result. But the framers of that instrument knew at that day as well as we know now, that in a country as broad as this, with so great a variety of climate, soil, and productions, there must necessarily be a corresponding diversity of institutions and domestic regulations adapted to the wants and interests of each locality. They knew that the laws and institutions which were well adapted to the mountains and valleys of New England were but ill suited to the rice plantations and the cotton fields of the Carolinas; they knew that our liberties depended upon reserving the right to the people of each State to make their own laws, establish their own institutions and control them at pleasure, without interference from the Federal Government, or from any other State or Territory, or any foreign country.

The Constitution, therefore, was based, and the Union was founded on the principle of dissimilarity in the domestic institutions and internal polity of the several States. The Union was founded on the theory that each State had peculiar interests, requiring peculiar legislation, and peculiar institutions different and distinct from every other State.—The Union rests upon the theory that no two States will be precisely alike in their domestic policy and institutions. Then I assert that this doctrine of uniformity among the domestic institutions of different States is repugnant to the States, subversive of the principles upon which the Union was based, revolutionary in its character, and leading directly to despotism if it is ever established.

Uniformity, sir, in local and domestic affairs, in a country of this extent, is despotism always. Show me centralism prescribing uniformity from the capital to all of its provinces in their local and domestic concerns, and I will show you a despotism as odious

and as insufferable as that of Austria or Naples. Dissimilarity is, therefore, the principle upon which the Union rests. It is founded upon the idea that each State must necessarily require different regulations; that no two States have precisely the same interests, and hence do not need precisely the same laws. How can you account for this Confederation of States upon any other principle? What becomes, then, of this doctrine that slavery must be established in all the States, or prohibited in all the States? If we will only conform to the principles upon which the Federal Union was based, there is no conflict—there can be no conflict. All you have to do is to recognize and obey the right of the people of every State to have just such institutions as they please, without consulting your wishes, your views, or your prejudices; and there can be no conflict. And, sir, inasmuch as the Constitution of the United States confers upon Congress the power, coupled with the duty of protecting each State against external aggression; inasmuch as that includes the power of suppressing and punishing conspiracies in one State against the institutions, property, people, or Government of every other State, I desire to carry out that power vigorously. Give us a law—such a law as the Constitution contemplates and authorizes—and I will show the Senator from New York (Mr. Seward) that there is a constitutional mode of repressing the "irrepressible conflict." [Suppressed applause in the galleries.] I would open the prison-doors and tell those conspirators against the peace of the Republic and the domestic tranquillity of other States, to select their cells, in which to drag out a miserable life, for the punishment of their crimes against the peace of society. Can any man say to us that, although this outrage has been perpetrated at Harper's Ferry, there is no danger of its recurrence? Sir, is not the Republican party still embodied, organized, sanguine, confident of success, and defiant in its professions? Do they not now boldly proclaim the same creed that they did before this invasion? It is true that some of them come forward and disavow the acts of John Brown at Harper's Ferry. I am glad that they do that; but I must be permitted to say to them that it is not sufficient that they disavow the act, unless they also repudiate and denounce the doctrines and teachings which produced it. Those doctrines and those teachings are still being poured into the minds of men throughout the country, in the shape of speeches, pamphlets, books, and partisan presses. The causes which produced the Harper's Ferry invasion are now in active operation. Is it true that the people of all the border States are required by the Constitution to have their hands tied, without the power of self-defence, and to remain impatient both day and night under a threatened invasion? Can you expect a people to be composed when they dare not lie down to sleep at night without first, like a sentinel on duty, marching around their houses and buildings, to see if a band of marauders are not approaching with torch and pistol. Sir, it requires more patience than a free man should ever show to submit to a state of constant annoyance, irritation and apprehension. If we desire to preserve this Union, we must remedy every evil within the Union and in obedience to the Constitution. If the Federal Government fails to act, either from choice or from an apprehension of a want of power, it cannot be expected that the States will be content to remain unprotected.

I see no hope, therefore, of peace, of fraternity, of preserving good feeling between the different portions of the Union, except by bringing the power of the Federal Government to the extent authorized by the Constitution to protect the people of all the States against any external violence of aggression. I repeat, that if the theory of the Constitution shall be carried out, and the right of the people of every State upheld to have just such institutions as they choose, there never can be a conflict, much less an irrepressible conflict between the free and the slaveholding States. Then, sir, the mode of preserving the peace is clear. This system of sectional warfare must cease. The Constitution has given the power, and all we ask of Congress is to give the means. By indictment and conviction, in the courts of our several States, of these conspirators, we will make such examples of the leader as will strike terror into the hearts of the others, and there will be an end of this excitement. You must check it by crushing out the conspiracy, the combination, and then there can be safety. When this is accomplished we will be able to restore that spirit of fraternity which inspired our Revolutionary fathers upon every battle-field, and which presided over the deliberations of the convention which framed the Constitution. Then we will be able to demonstrate to you that there is no evil unredressed in this Union, for which the Union furnishes a remedy. Let us execute the Constitution in the spirit in which it was made; let Congress pass all the laws necessary and proper to give full and complete effect to every guarantee of the Constitution; let it authorize the punishment of combinations or conspiracies in any State or Territory against the property, institutions, people or Government of every other State or Territory, and there will be no excuse, no desire for dissolution. Let us leave the people of every State perfectly free to form and regulate their own domestic institutions in their own way let each of them retain slavery; just as long as it pleases, as long as it will choose; let it act, as that good old golden principle which teaches all men to mind their own business, and let their neighbors alone, and then this Union can endure forever as our fathers made it, divided into free and slave States, just as the people of each may determine for themselves.

Mr. Fessenden, of Maine, said he was somewhat at a loss to imagine the necessity for the resolution introduced by the Senator from Illinois. A committee had been appointed to investigate the Harper's Ferry outbreak, and he was willing to await their report. The Senator, however, apparently distrusting their capacity, had undertaken to instruct them in their duty, and availed himself of the opportunity to make a political speech for political effect. His argument as to the power of Congress was nothing new. No Senator was more anxious than himself to protect the States from invasion. On that point he agreed with the Senator from Illinois, but would wait the report of the committee. He denied that the Republican party was responsible for the Harper's Ferry invasion. There was nothing new in that charge. It had been made repeatedly here and in the newspapers. It had got to be a dogma of the Democratic party, and part of their scheme for the next campaign. It was intended to effect the fall election. Prior to 1854 the slavery agitation had been quieted. Both parties had declared for peace, when the excitement was renewed by the introduction of the Kansas-Nebraska bill, and kept up by the subsequent attempt to force slavery upon a free territory by force of arms. Then it was that John Brown learned the lesson which he practiced at Harper's Ferry. There

THE HUNTINGDON GLOBE, A DEMOCRATIC FAMILY JOURNAL, DEVOTED TO LOCAL AND GENERAL NEWS, &C.

is nothing in the practice or teachings of the Republican party to authorize the charge made against it. To call upon the Republicans not to agitate came with bad grace from those who had been counselling aggression from the beginning. He referred to the declaration of the former Senator from South Carolina, that the object of the repeal of the Missouri Compromise was to extend the area of slavery. The Senator from Illinois had attempted to sustain his charge by a reference to the speeches of Messrs. Lincoln and Seward, but none of the extracts bore him out. The language of the Senator from New York had been misinterpreted. He had had the misfortune to become the author of a phrase, which, if expressed in two or three phrases, would not have attracted attention. It had never been said that the free and slave States could not live together as friends. He believed that they could; but if free and slave laborers were brought together, on the same soil, there would be antagonism. That was what was meant.

Mr. Davis, of Mississippi, wished a clearer explanation. Mr. Fessenden said free labor elevated the laborer, while slave labor depressed and degraded him. When the two come together they antagonize. He asked the Senator from Illinois a question, to which

Mr. Douglas replied that his doctrine was that the Federal Government should exercise no power, directly or indirectly, to control, form or otherwise influence the domestic institutions of the States or Territories. Mr. Fessenden. That is only squatter sovereignty—the Senator's favorite doctrine. No one ever pretended that the Government could interfere with the institutions of the States. He controverted the idea that a diversity of institutions was essential to the general prosperity of a country, and asserted to the fullest extent, that the Government could not interfere with the institutions of the States. Any charge that the Republicans favored, this charge is unfounded. He asked if the Senator from Illinois had said that the Republicans not only wanted to repress the extension of slavery, but also to make war on slavery as it existed in the States.

Mr. Douglas. I did. Mr. Fessenden. I deny it. It could not be found in the party creed. The Republican party had been formed to prevent the introduction of slavery into free Territories. He denied the right of Southern men to take slavery into a Territory, unless the law there recognized slavery. He hated and loathed slavery, but did not hate slaveholders. The object of the Northern Democrats was to inflame the South against all but themselves, so as to get into political power. He was opposed to slavery in the abstract, but did not wish to interfere with it where it existed. When it was charged that the Republicans were warring on the South, it should be recollected that they held the doctrines of the fathers of the Republic. The Senator from Virginia had admitted that the views of Southern men on slavery are not now what they were.

Mr. Mason said the South, after a full consideration and experience, had arrived at the conclusion that slavery ennobled both races. The early fathers were not Abolitionists. They did not think it practicable or expedient to abolish slavery. They thought that by cutting off the slave trade, slavery would die out itself. The ordinance of 1787 was aimed at the slave trade. They thought that by reducing the area where slavery could be used, the slave trade would be stopped.

Mr. Fessenden said the Senator had admitted all he desired. The early men of this nation thought that by restricting it, the institution of slavery would die out. They wanted it to die. That is the position of the Republican party. The Senator from Illinois was indifferent whether slavery was extended or not. Born in a free State, he preferred free institutions. That was the whole offence of the Republican party. We have been further told that if we elect a man of our views, regularly, and in a constitutional form, to the Presidency, the Union will be dissolved. While the Senator from Illinois is devising means to repress the invasion of one State by another, he might have suggested a provision for the threatened contingency.

Mr. Douglas said he had introduced his resolution because the occasion called for it. It is not necessary to put in a clause for the contingency referred to, as it was an event not within the probabilities.

Mr. Fessenden said the Senator had great confidence in his own powers; it was quite likely he had a higher opinion of them than any one else. It is singular that they were constantly threatened with what would be done in case of a certain event which is not likely to occur. The inference he drew was that the gentlemen on the other side were quite apprehensive on the subject. This talk of dissolution was a disease which appeared every four years. The people of the free States don't care about it. For himself, if the election of a President in the constitutional mode was to cause a dissolution of the Union, the sooner the question was settled the better.

Mr. Douglas said some men could not conceive of action flowing from patriotic motives. He had brought in his resolution because he thought the time had arrived for practical legislation. He had referred to the causes which had produced the outrage, and pointed out that they still existed. If the Senators on the other side would vote for such a bill as he proposed, he would think a very great change had occurred. When they agreed to make conspiracies to run off fugitive slaves a felony, he would think they had indeed changed. In the towns and cities of the North, where the Republicans had a majority, the fugitive-slave law could not be executed. Could it be executed in the town where the Senator from New York lived? Did they recollect the Jerry rescue?

Mr. Fessenden said he would go as far as any one to prevent conspiracy in one State to invade another. He could not say what he would do in regard to running off fugitives. He would meet that question when it arose.

Mr. Douglas. Why not punish the running off of slaves as well as the running off of horses? The impunity with which the crime of running off slaves can be perpetrated keeps up the irritation. When it was made a penitentiary offence to conspire against property in another State, then we would get at the root of the evil. The Republicans were no doubt ready to vote for a law fair in its terms but not calculated to be efficient in its operation. It was only necessary to refer to the Philadelphia platform to show the hostility of the Republican party, where the slavery and polygamy are classed together as twin relics of barbarism, and the polygamist and slaveholder are placed in the same category. He saw that the Republicans were lowering their flag. If he could attribute it to a good motive, he would be glad of it. Those living

farthest from the negro, and knowing the least about him, were the most solicitous for the poor slave. In the Southern portions of the free States which border on the slave States you find a good feeling existing among the inhabitants towards the domestic institutions of their neighbors, because they know what the condition of the slave is, and in proportion as you go North the feeling against slavery increases.

Mr. Douglas then again resorted to Mr. Seward's speech to show that his interpretation of it was correct, and that he (Mr. Seward) maintained the doctrine that the Union could not exist half free and half slave. The object of the Republicans was to hem in slavery in order to smother it out or starve it out, or, as the French in Algeria served the Arabs when they retreated into their caverns—smoke them out. The idea was to keep up agitation along the border States so as to render slave property insecure, and drive it further South. Then, when Kentucky, by this process, is made free, the same system is to be pursued till slavery is extinguished. He quoted from Mr. Seward's speech at Rochester, to show that he meant that the irrepressible conflict must go on till there is either not one slave State left or all become slaveholding.

In regard to the charge of indifference on his part whether the States adopted free or slave institutions, what he meant was that it was none of his business whether the people of Kansas adopted freedom or slavery. It was their business, and they would act according to their wants. He opposed slavery in Illinois because it was not adapted to the requirements of the people. Slavery would go where it could be profitably employed. You could not keep it out by enactment. Illinois adopted slavery in spite of the ordinance of 1787, and abolished it when it was found that it did not suit. Slavery was a question of political economy, and not a proper subject of legislation. The people interested are the best judges. He wanted them to decide their institutions for themselves, and if they were allowed to carry out their wishes, did not for himself care how they decided. He repelled the charge that the Kansas-Nebraska bill produced agitation. The political friends of the Senator from Maine sent desperadoes to Kansas, to create disturbances and regulate the elections. It was just such combinations that he wished to reach. He wanted the people to regulate their affairs in their own way. Gentlemen may call it squatter sovereignty, or what they pleased.

A Union Speech by the Speaker Elect. The following interesting incident we clip from the *Washington Star*, of last week:

Mr. Pennington was waited upon last evening, at Willard's, by numerous friends, who after exchanging the usual salutations, and congratulating him on his elevation to the high and honorable post of Speaker, were invited to accept of that gentleman's hospitality. At eleven o'clock Wither's Band arrived and serenaded him, performing in spirited style a number of national airs. Some two hundred or more persons were in a short time assembled, and as soon as the band had concluded, three cheers were given for Mr. Pennington, and then loud calls made for that gentleman.

Mr. Pennington on being introduced, said: I am very much indebted to you, my friends, for the pleasing visit you have made me this night. When we hear a national air, it always satisfies me that we belong to one country, and I have no belief in the doctrine that the time is near at hand, or can be, that we are to be separated. We are one people, and I trust in Heaven we shall ever remain so.

There will always be in a free country like ours, diversities of opinion, different views, and a great variety of interests which must necessarily prevail; but there is a spirit of patriotism that burns in our hearts that will not yet be extinguished. Our land is a land of freemen, our liberties were achieved by great exertions and services of our fathers, and I believe no man in this generation will let this blessed inheritance go to pieces. And if we do wrong at one time, you remember the saying of Mr. Clay, that old patriot, when he went home to Kentucky, after having voted for the compensation law, on being addressed by some old man, who said, "Clay, you have done wrong." "Well," said he, "my friend, if you were out gunning, and on pulling the trigger your gun didn't go off, what would you do? Would you throw it away, or would you try it over again?" "Nay," said he, "I would pick the flint and try it over." Now if anything is done wrong in this country, a little time will make it right, because we have a national feeling and a national honor.

When I heard the national air played as you came in here to-night, it went to my heart, and I said as long as our national songs remain, this country will be united. Discordant States! I think no man in his sober senses can agree to any such proposition. I tell you now there never was a greater mistake than to believe that northern men have any bad feeling against Southern men, or the body of Southern men against Northern. My friends, it always belongs to the republican institutions, that there must be a great variety of public opinion upon all questions; and our only security is to bear and to forbear; and the strength of our institutions depends upon love of country. And if we are not imbued with patriotic feelings, there is no hope for the stability of our country. But my faith is this, that we all love our country, and that we will abide by her destiny for good or for evil.

I thank you for the high compliment which I feel you have bestowed upon me by this visit. I am glad the House is organized. If this organization had been effected by the selection of any other gentleman, perhaps it would have been better, but be assured I will endeavor to discharge the arduous duties of the high position to which I have just been elevated as best I can, and to preserve this glorious Union intact.

The *Louisville Democrat*, one of the best and most conservative journals in the South, truly says:

"If it were agreed at once that Congress could not go out of the letter of the Constitution on the slavery question, all this incompetency would vanish, and this sectional contest would subside."

"When the Constitution speaks, there is no trouble in its construction."

"Congress has power to pass a fugitive-slave law and execute it."

"It has power to suppress the African slave trade."

"It has power to count five slaves equal to three white men in the ratio of representation."

"Not another item of power does the Constitution give to Congress over the subject of slavery. All this effort to find power to establish, prohibit, or protect it in the Territories is vain. No such power is granted in the Constitution. There is not a word of it in the document."

THE GLOBE.

HUNTINGDON, PA.

Wednesday, February 8, 1860.

BLANKS! BLANKS! BLANKS!

CONSTABLES SALES, ATTACHMENTS, SUMMONS, SUBPENAS, SCHOOL ORDERS, LEASES FOR HOUSES, COMMON BONDS, WARRANTS, NOTES, with a waiver of the \$300 Law. JUDGMENT NOTES, with a waiver of the \$300 Law. ARTICLES OF AGREEMENT, with Teachers. MARRIAGE CERTIFICATES, for Justices of the Peace and Ministers of the Gospel. COMPLAINT, WARRANT, and COMMITMENT, in case of Assault and Battery, and Affray. SILENCE FACIAS, to recover amount of Judgment. COLLECTORS' RECEIPTS, for State, County, School, Borough and Township Taxes. Printed on superior paper, and for sale at the Office of the **HUNTINGDON GLOBE**. BLANKS, of every description, printed to order, neatly, at short notice, and on good paper.

New Advertisements.

Banking House Notice.
Trevory for sale, by F. Conner.
Stray Heifer, by Wilson Edwards.
Go to Lewis! if you want Valentines.
Store Room for rent and fixtures for sale, by T. P. Love.
Watches, Jewelry and Silver-Ware, by Stauffer & Harley.

The Reading Convention.

In regard to the Democratic State Convention, which is shortly to assemble at Reading, (says the *Harrisburg State Sentinel*), the questions have been narrowed down to these:—Will the delegates, coming from the people, make a nomination for the people, or will the authorities at Washington make a nomination for the delegates? Will the delegates appoint delegates to the Charleston Convention to represent the Democracy of the State, or the President of the United States?

These are startling questions; but the movements of the times, and the projected movements of the times are also startling; and the issues involved may as well be met now as at a later period.

It was only the other day we heard a federal office-holder declare that the President was the head of the party, and, as the head, had not only the right to suggest and direct, but to command its movements; and this extreme federal idea seems now to be generally adopted and acted on by those who constitute the regular cohorts, the drilled battalions of the Washington Administration.

We take exception to it; we denounce it as a heresy; as anti-democratic and disorganizing. We deny the right of the National Administration to interfere at all in our local State politics. To acknowledge the right would be to place almost omnipotent power in their hands, and to make the President, with his army of office-holders, and the public treasury at his command, almost as dangerous a despot as any European or Asiatic tyrant.

The creed of Democracy is that the people have the sole right, unswayed by official power, to choose their own delegates and their own candidates; and their position, as citizens of a Government whose prosperity and existence depend upon their patriotism, virtue and intelligence, makes it their duty to do so.

Now, will this right be insisted on, and this duty faithfully performed by the representatives of the people in the Reading Convention, or will they fail in integrity, and follow the dictates of the politicians and office-holders there who represent the Washington Administration?

What we have to fear from mismanagement at Reading is not only the defeat of our State and Presidential tickets next fall, but of candidates for Congress, for the State Legislature, and for county offices of every grade. We risk, in fact, the utter annihilation of the Democratic party in Pennsylvania—we risk giving over the State to the Opposition for an indefinite number of years, if not forever?—And who is willing to do this, for the mere purpose of pleasing the President?

Look calmly, and see how things stand.—We all know that the President has interfered, is interfering, and will interfere with the nomination for Governor, with the party platform, with the selection of delegates to Charleston. We all know, too, that if he succeeds, if delegates are controlled by his wishes, or swayed by his command, that the nominee and the platform will go down together—not by 17,000, as last year, but by 30,000—a majority which must in spite of any exertions that may be made, or legerdemain which may be practised, seal the fate of the State in the Presidential contest which will follow. Now, the simple question is, Will the Democracy of Pennsylvania, will the representatives of the Democracy at Reading permit this great evil to be accomplished?

A few weeks ago it was well understood that the favorite of the Administration for Governor was William Wittie, of Philadelphia. That programme, we are well assured, has been recently changed. John L. Dawson is now the man. So the Washington authorities say, and within a few days both gentlemen have been at Washington submitting their respective claims to the arbitration of the Cabinet. Mr. Wittie has, then, for some reason, unknown to us as yet, been dropped by the President, and Mr. Dawson adopted as the Washington candidate.

But have the people nothing to say in the selection, are the Democratic masses to remain silent, are their representatives at the Reading Convention to simply record their votes for Mr. Buchanan's man, adopt Mr. Buchanan's platform, appoint Mr. Buchanan's delegates to Charleston, and go home, having faithfully served their master?

If this is to be so—if the snares have been set, and the birds caught, let us know it.—We submit to no such fraudulent proceeding. In the name of the Democracy of Pennsylvania, we protest against the consummation of the proposed iniquity, and call upon others who desire the success of the party, and have more interest in it than we have, to protest also, in time, while yet protesting may avail. Mind, we entertain no objection against either of the gentlemen named; both are probably strong men in the party, and in the eyes of their respective friends deservedly strong.—But we object to the interference of the Federal Government, in a matter which belongs exclusively to the Democracy of the State. We, therefore, speak not against the men, but against the manner in which they are brought forward—as the pets of the President, not as the free, unbiased choice of the people.

Would such a proceeding be fair toward other candidates—and there are others who have been brought forward by the people themselves—would it be fair toward the party, whose success should be held to be above all other considerations? We leave it to those other candidates, their friends and the party to answer.

We must look at these things calmly, and speak boldly before the Convention has finished its work, if we would succeed.

For two successive years has our glorious old party been immolated on the shrine of personal ambition. Twice already has the gallant Democracy of Pennsylvania been led to slaughter, in order that, from its reeking blood, incense might be wafted to the throne of drunken power to appease its unholy lust; and if our ears deceive us not, we still hear the cry for blood—more blood! How long, Democrats of Pennsylvania, is this thing to continue? How many more sacrifices must be made to satiate the craving maws of hungry politicians who know no other cry than give! give! Have we not yet paid the price demanded of us, or do the conspirators against Democracy claim from us eternal bondage?

For ourselves we hate subserviency to power; we detest tyranny in every shape; we war against treason, corruption, and hypocrisy; we are free—free to think, to speak, to write and to act. In a word, we are Democrats, jealous of power, and fearless in defence of our principles and our rights; and we now sound the alarm to our fellow Democrats—we call upon them to awake, to arise, to act, and act boldly and vigorously, or make up their minds to be forever fallen.

What Kentucky thinks of Pennsylvania.

The *Louisville Democrat*, which is one of the warmest and most sensible advocates of the nomination of Mr. Douglas, in the country, thinks that perhaps the proceedings of the recent Convention in Indiana will open the eyes of the smart people who have been engineering the Democratic party until they have run it on the breakers. Things begin to look as though Douglas was in the Democratic party, and a real live member of it.—Managing and wire pulling are weak weapons, when the people make up their mind to act for themselves.

The editor of the *Democrat* rejoices most Democratically over the result in Indiana, and thus concludes the article with a hint to us of Pennsylvania not to make new tests within our own household:

What Indiana has done, every free State will do. The office-holders of Pennsylvania may, perhaps, juggle the mass of the Democracy out of their choice. If they do, look out for popular resentment at the polls next November. The politicians can get along very well whilst they follow popular impulse.—They can sometimes suppress public sentiment; but roused to its present pitch in the free States, said politicians had better get out of the way. And they will get out of the way. They will turn somersaults. They will swear they never meant anything else. All this comes of discussing the Cincinnati platform; and of making war on the man who stood by it; who has stuck to his creed, his promises and pledges. Those who endorsed his doctrine in 1850, and up to 1857, endorse it yet, and will stand by him. It is not Douglas that this war has been waged upon. It is not Douglas that is so powerful in the free States. It is the fixed uncompromising sentiment of the Democratic party. We have warned you, gentlemen, that it would overwhelm you.

You have depended on Indiana. She would stand up to your new tests; you have depended on skill and political management; you have made the grand mistake of supposing the people could be managed and turned to any account. All a mistake! We have told our readers the truth all the while. Who will be deceived now? Who is still so blind he can't see? We warn all politicians, that this expression at Indianapolis is but a feeble expression of popular sentiment. It is nothing to what you would hear at the polls.—These new tests of Democracy, and this war on the champion of the Northern wing of the party, are full of all the disasters we have predicted.

It is idle to waste time with men who have so often shown their ignorance of the sentiments of the party. The fog clears up, and it is easy now to see where we are. It was easy to see where we would be long ago; but for the blind, unreasoning hostility to a particular man. They see now that this war on Douglas is a war on the Democratic party, and their new test is repudiated by State after State.

A NEW PARTY.—A new party, "The Union Party," held its first meeting in Philadelphia, on Saturday night last. It was largely attended, and many patriotic speeches delivered. The speakers generally were from the ranks of the Republican and American parties, as were also those presiding as officers.

A Forney jubilee came off in Washington on Friday night last. He made a very pointed speech himself, and was followed by Hickman, Haskins and others.

PENNSYLVANIA LEGISLATURE.—Mr. Africa has presented petitions from citizens of Huntingdon county:

One praying for an annual appropriation of \$10,000, for the Training School for feeble minded and idiotic children of Media, in the county of Delaware.

One praying that the premium on fox scalps in Huntingdon county may be increased to \$1.50.

One praying for the incorporation of a company to erect a Hotel in the borough of Huntingdon.

Also reported An Act to incorporate the Huntingdon and Cassville Turnpike Road Company.

THE CONTEST IN CONGRESS.—The contest in the House for Speaker was ended on Wednesday last by the election of Hon. Wm. Pennington of New Jersey, formerly an old line Whig, but at present, an Opposition. The final ballot stood, for Pennington 117; McClelland, Democrat, 85; Gilmore, American 16; Scattering 15.

On Friday John W. Forney was elected Clerk, and H. W. Hoffman, of Maryland, Sergeant-at-arms.

The jury in the case of Andrew Stephens, another of the Harper's Ferry party, on Saturday, returned a verdict of guilty of treason, murder and conspiracy. He will be hung.

The Washington correspondent of the *N. Y. Herald* says, under date of Feb. 3:

"The Senate Printing Investigating Committee met this morning. Mr. Wendell underwent an examination upwards of three hours. It appears that some seven or eight parties were interested in the public printing, namely: Steadman, Banks, McLean, Walker, Rice, Severns, and Bowman. He stated that he had paid out during the past three years, over one hundred thousand dollars for party support to newspapers, and in aid of election expenses, in Pennsylvania principally, but extending over New Jersey, New York, Maryland, Ohio, &c. Considerable had been paid by official authority, and some of his own free will. He also stated that by the action of the Senate in electing Bowman, who had given the work to Blair & Rives, he had been left penniless, with the largest establishment in the Union lying idle. Bowman's conduct towards Wendell was shown up in a very bad light. Bowman, it appears, has given part of the work to Jewett, editor of the *Fillmore* organ at Buffalo. A. D. Banks and J. O. Severns were also examined. They did not seem to know much, except that they had received some material aid from Wendell.

Wendell testified that out of the post office blanks printing, he paid, in 1857, the sum of six thousand dollars to the *Pennsylvanian* newspaper, of Philadelphia, and to the *Evening Argus*, of Philadelphia, the sum of five thousand dollars. He informed the committee that he went into doubtful Democratic districts in Pennsylvania, and spent money freely for the benefit of the supporters of the policy of the Administration. Mr. Rice, of the *Pennsylvanian*, was also before the committee, and did not discredit the testimony of Wendell. There are rich developments forthcoming before the committee."

A SPECIMEN OF AN AFRICAN RULER.—PECCARILIOUS OF THE KING OF DAHOMEY.—A correspondent of the *Boston Post*, writing from Badagry, West Africa, under the date of September 27, gives the following characteristics of an influential gentleman of Africa: "Dahomey is governed probably by the most tyrannical monarch in the whole world. His word is law, and whoever thwarts him loses his head without the least ceremony, but I must say is by far the best governed country I have seen in Africa. He is king of the most powerful and warlike people on this continent, and is entirely engaged in hostilities against the smaller and weaker tribes, to obtain prisoners many of whom are sold as slaves, and large numbers are offered as sacrifices upon the death of any favorite of his majesty. While I was at Whydah he offered up 360 victims at the federal ceremonies of his chiefs. At the death of King Guzo, who died last November, 800 captives were killed, besides 200 of his favorite wives. Since then the number of victims killed by this blood-thirsty wretch for his father is 2,400. Previous to my going to Whydah, the King had sent his messenger with his cane, commanding all people, both black and white, who were trading in his country, to appear at Dahomey, to attend the grand custom in honor of the late King, his father. As I was not in Whydah at the time, the message was sent to me, saying that he had been successful in his expeditions, and had taken three thousand prisoners, whose blood would be used to wash the graves of his ancestors. Whenever the King's name is mentioned, all within hearing fall down and kiss the earth, and cover themselves with dust. They would not deliver the message to me until I stood up and took off my hat. You have to take the cane in your hand during the delivery of the message, when you are supposed to be in direct communication with the King; the messengers all the time are prostrate on the ground. Three men are always sent, one to watch the others, and see the message is given as received. This is always the case when any message is sent to the next world, to see that the way is not lost.

"The present King's title is Reernee Reernee which means the lion, at whose name both man and beast flee. About three months ago the fetish told the King that the people of a certain village were the means of the late King's death. He consequently attacked them, and killed every soul—six hundred in number—not sparing one. So much for this wholesale butcher."

MARYLAND LEGISLATURE.—In the Maryland Legislature, the resolutions received from the South Carolina Legislature, proposing a Disunion Convention of Southern delegates, were read on Friday.

The leading men of both parties denounced them as a proposition for national treason.—There was quite a strong vote on a motion to lay them on the table without reading, and they would have been so disposed of but for the plea of respect due a sovereign State.—They were finally made the order of the day for Wednesday next.

The debate was of the most exciting character, only two members apologizing for the course of the South Carolina Legislature.

Hon. Jacob Fry, Jr., for Governor.

We invite attention to the following article taken from the *Easton Argus*, a long established and one of the most respectable and influential Democratic papers in the State, edited by Post Master Hutter. The figures presented by the *Argus* show that Mr. Fry has been a faithful and most valuable public officer, and that with such a man as Governor, the people of Pennsylvania might calculate with certainty upon a speedy reduction of her heavy debt, and an abatement in their taxes. The masses of the Democracy know this, and from all sections of the State they are for him:—

THE NEXT GOVERNOR.—The public mind is being considerably excited upon the question, "Who shall be the next Democratic candidate for Governor?" And as the question is one of magnitude and great importance to the Democratic party, we feel disposed to treat upon it a little more at large, than we have thus far. The paramount importance of this question to the great Democratic party of Pennsylvania, as well as to the country, we think amply justifies every man who has the success of our party, as well as the peace and quiet of the country at heart to speak out, and thus lead the public mind to such conclusions as wisdom and sound discretion will dictate. At the last election a large majority in the State was thrown against the Democratic party, and the prominent inquiry now should be, can this majority be overcome? And who is the man with whom this desirable end can be accomplished? We are prepared to say, that be the nominee of the Reading Convention whom he may, we are ready to give him a cordial and hearty support; but in the present state of public opinion, and having the desperate efforts that will be made by our opponents in view, we think it altogether right and proper to give an honest indication in favor of one or the other of the prominent candidates, as we think the sentiment of the masses will justify. We have heretofore expressed in our columns a preference for Hon. Hopewell Hepburn, of Pittsburgh, but it is evident that the choice of the Convention will fall upon one of the gentlemen whose claims are being actively pressed. Under these circumstances, we incline to the nomination of the Hon. Jacob Fry, Jr., of Montgomery county. And we can start out by saying, that no man can be presented to the people who has a better record than Mr. Fry. He held the office of Prothonotary and Clerk of the several Courts of Montgomery county for three years under an appointment of the late Gov. Wolf, the duties of which office he discharged with ability and such satisfaction to his constituents, that soon after his voluntary retirement, he was elected to Congress, where he continued for four years up to 1839. He remained in private life till 1853, when he was called upon to represent the county in the State Legislature. He was re-elected in 1854, when nearly the whole ticket, including his colleagues for the Legislature, fell under the weight of Know-Nothingism. In 1856 he was elected Auditor General of the State, in which last position he has discharged his duty with singular fidelity to the Commonwealth. His services at the head of the finances of the State, have been of such value, and are so well and generally known and admitted, that no man in our opinion could be presented to the people with an equal chance of success. The collections and disbursements of the State are through his hands, and under and subject so far to his control, that everything in the way of economical administration of the office he occupies, depends upon its faithful management. We propose to adduce a few figures to show to some extent the services rendered to the Commonwealth by Mr. Fry, since he has been Auditor General.

By the Auditor General's report of 1856, the expenses of the Commonwealth for the fiscal year, ending in November, of that year, were \$6,662,969 04.

These expenses did not include anything paid to the Sinking Fund Commissioners.

By the Aud. Gen's report of 1857, Mr. Fry's 1st year, the expenses of the Com. amounted to \$6,976,415 26 From this deduct amount paid to Sinking Fund Commissioners C38 125 00

Actual expenses for 1857, \$5,338,280 26 By Aud. General's report 1858, expenses were \$4,708,016 31 Paid to Sinking Fund, \$327,777 85

Actual expenses for 1858, \$4,357,538 97 By Aud. General's report 1859, expenses were \$4,329,400 92 Paid to Sinking Fund, \$53,654 62

Actual expenses for 1859, \$3,905,755 28 The public debt, (including temporary loans) were the time Mr. Fry came into Auditor General's office, was \$40,750,357 87 The same is now as stated in the Governor's last message, \$38,478,961 00

Making an actual reduction of \$2,271,396 87

Thus we see, that by faithful attention to the public business, the yearly expenses of the State have been cut down in the time Mr. Fry was in office, from \$6,662,969 04, to \$3,905,755 28, and while that has been done, the revenue for the same time has rapidly increased. The item alone of Corporation Tax, has more than doubled in that time by the addition of a large number of incorporations that have heretofore not been paying any taxes. It has been by reducing the expenses of the Commonwealth and increasing her revenues, that so large a sum has been paid within the last three years upon our indebtedness. This will be fully appreciated by the tax payers, and on this account we think the nomination of Mr. Fry would meet the decided approbation of the people.

Aside from these considerations, Mr. Fry is a gentleman of sterling worth and genuine, old fashioned Dutch integrity. He knows the wants and necessities of the people, is a prudent and economical house-keeper and a faithful guardian of the interests of the State. He has much legislative experience. It is very probable that important legislation, seriously affecting the tax payers of our State, will be asked for within the next three years, and we honestly believe that Mr. Fry is just the man to protect the public interests. We believe him to be the strongest man, and that he will best unite the party. It is true that he is not an experienced public speaker, nor do we deem that essential. The best governors we ever had, Snyder, Shunk and others, were no orators, and have other gentlemen in our ranks who can stump the State, if it is deemed necessary. We favor the nomination of Mr. Fry because he is a true representative of the German element of Pennsylvania, because his record is clear and pure, because he is honest and capable, because his nomination will promote union and harmony in the ranks of the Democratic party, and because we sincerely believe he would make one of the purest Executives Pennsylvania ever had. We hope the delegates from this district will support him in Convention.

ven under Seal of Office, 4th January, 1860. \$1852 35
 GEORGE W. MATTERN, }
 JOHN FLENNER, } Commissioners.
 M. F. CAMPBELL, }
 et: HENRY W. MILLER, Clerk. [Feb. 1, 1860-44.]

B can be fitted at BENJ. JACOBS' store in Market square, Huntingdon, Pa. (oct28.)